

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fidalgo (5,598,032).

Fidalgo discloses a method for manufacturing smart card having at least two turn antenna 5, a pair of connection pads 15 that are both disposed on the common side of the antenna turns, a support sheet 3 (note that both antenna turns and pads are on same size of the substrate 3), connecting the end of the antenna to one of the connection pads by insulating bridge 6 (see Fig. 3 for the teaching of the above, further also refer to the discussion at col. 3, lines 35-36).

Note: reference 6 as broadly as readable as Insulation Bridge for connecting of the antenna and the connection pads as recited in claim 1.

As applied to claim 2, Noting related Fig. 5 of the Fidalgo shows the insulation covering the antenna turns 5 in one zone as right hand side of Fig. 3 further the other zone as opposed to the one zone where a conductive element as 11 being connected to the outer end as top of the antenna 5 (see related Fig. 5 and the discussion at col. 3, lines 64-to col. 4, line 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 14 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fidago.

As applied to claim 14, regarding the module is formed by a solder with a low melting point. As applied to claim 14, it is inherent that to use low melting solder for connection module to the antenna in order to protect the extremely heat that may damage to the forming device.

As applied to claims 15-20, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art to incorporate the use of particular materials as recited in these claims since it was known in the art that selecting a material from a host of group of available materials on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Limitations of claims 16-20 are similar to that as discussed above.

As applied to claims 21-23, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to choose any desired means for connection between the connection pads of the antenna and the conductive pads of the module including the use of grease charged, silicon gasket charged, and/or additional gold deposited by thermal compression since applicant has not disclosed that these features are critical, patentably distinguishing features and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the

Art Unit: 3729

conventional bonding techniques as taught by each of the prior art reference (i.e., see the discussion of Fidago at cols. 5-6).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2/12/07 have been acknowledged.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 4, 13 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Claims 45-46 are allowed (see reasons as provided from Advisory Action dated 2/2/07).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art references are cited for their teaching of method of manufacturing chip card or smart card devices.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mt

/Minh Trinh/
Primary Examiner, 3729

12/5/07